

NOTICE: This opinion is subject to formal revision before publication in the bound volumes of NLRB decisions. Readers are requested to notify the Executive Secretary, National Labor Relations Board, Washington, D.C. 20570, of any typographical or other formal errors so that corrections can be included in the bound volumes.

**Centerpoint Energy Houston Electric, LLC and International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Union 66, Petitioner.** Case 16–RC–229214

October 31, 2019

DECISION ON REVIEW

BY CHAIRMAN RING AND MEMBERS MCFERRAN  
AND KAPLAN

The issue presented in this case is whether the Regional Director properly directed an *Armour-Globe*<sup>1</sup> election to determine whether the Employer’s service area assistants (SAAs) wish to be included in an existing unit of construction, maintenance, and operations employees.

On November 1, 2018, the Regional Director issued a Decision and Direction of Election in which he found that the SAAs may appropriately be included in the existing unit as plant clerical employees and that the petition was not barred by the parties’ collective-bargaining agreement. Thereafter, in accordance with Section 102.67 of the Board’s Rules and Regulations, the Employer filed a timely request for review.

On April 29, 2019, the Board granted the Employer’s request for review with respect to whether the petitioned-

for SAAs share a sufficient community of interest with the current bargaining unit to warrant inclusion of the SAAs in that unit. The Board denied review in all other respects.<sup>2</sup> Thereafter, the Employer and the Petitioner filed briefs on review.

The National Labor Relations Board has delegated its authority in this proceeding to a three-member panel.<sup>3</sup>

Having carefully considered the entire record in this proceeding, including the briefs on review, we affirm the Regional Director’s Decision and Direction of Election.<sup>4</sup>

Dated, Washington, D.C. October 31, 2019

\_\_\_\_\_  
John F. Ring, Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lauren McFerran, Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
Marvin E. Kaplan, Member

(SEAL) NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

<sup>1</sup> *Armour & Co.*, 40 NLRB 1333 (1942); *Globe Machine & Stamping Co.*, 3 NLRB 294 (1937).

<sup>2</sup> Member McFerran would have denied the Employer’s request for review in its entirety, for the reasons stated in her dissent from the Order partially granting review. *Centerpoint Energy Houston Electric, LLC*, Case 16–RC–229214 (April 29, 2019) (unpublished).

<sup>3</sup> Member Emanuel took no part in the consideration of this case.

<sup>4</sup> In denying review, Chairman Ring and Member Kaplan apply extant Board law concerning “plant clericals.” They note, however, that Board law in that area is inconsistent and that they would reconsider the “plant clericals” analysis, and its value in determining whether bargaining units are appropriate, in a future case.